

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated December 9, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 9, 2009. Claims 5, 18, 25, 30 and 35 have been amended and new claims 37-42 have been added to more clarify certain aspects of the invention. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview on February 2 and February 3, 2009. During the interview, all the claims in view of the prior art of record were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the amendments made to claims 5, 18, 25, 30 and 35 appear to place the present application in condition for allowance. The Examiner further indicated that he may confer with other examiners and conduct further search before allowing the present application.

Claims 5-6, 18, 30 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,430,105 ("Stephen") in view of US Patent No. 6,353,577 ("Orban") and US Publication No. 20020126575 ("Bittleston"). Claims 5, 18, 30 and 35 have been amended to include various limitations. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0006], [0032], [0035]-[0036] and [0040]. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Stephen, nor Orban, nor Bittleston, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than an acceptable distance from an initial position based on the comparison; and if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than the acceptable distance, then repositioning the at least one ocean bottom cable to a desired position," as recited in amended claim 5; "determining an AC signal in response to a change in the orientation or inclination of the at least one orientation sensor; and determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison and the AC signal," as recited in amended claim 18; and "determine an AC signal in response to a change in the orientation or inclination of the at least one ocean bottom cable; and determine whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison and

the AC signal, “ as recited in amended claim 30; and “means for repositioning the at least one ocean bottom cable to a desired position if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved; and means for performing a seismic shooting operation if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has not moved,” as recited in amended claim 35. Accordingly, claims 5, 18, 30 and 35 are now patentable over Stephen, Orban, and Bittleston. Claim 6 is also patentable over Stephen, Orban, and Bittleston since it depends from claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen, Bittleston and ADXL202E (“ADXL202E”). Claim 25 has been amended to now include “determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than an acceptable distance using the at least one initial inclination and the at least one current inclination; and if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has not moved more than the acceptable distance, then performing a seismic shooting operation.” Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0006], [0032], [0035]-[0036] and [0040]. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Stephen, nor Bittleston, nor ADXL202E, alone or in combination, teaches this newly added limitation. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-6, 18, 30 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Orban and US Patent No. 6229102 (“Sato”). As mentioned above, claims 5, 18, 30 and 35 have been amended to include various limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Stephen, nor Orban, nor Sato, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses “determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than an acceptable distance from an initial position based on the comparison; and if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than the acceptable distance, then repositioning the at least one ocean bottom cable to a desired position,” as recited in amended claim 5; “determining an AC signal in response to a change in the orientation or inclination of the at least one orientation sensor; and determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison and the AC signal,” as recited in amended

claim 18; and “determine an AC signal in response to a change in the orientation or inclination of the at least one ocean bottom cable; and determine whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison and the AC signal, “ as recited in amended claim 30; and “means for repositioning the at least one ocean bottom cable to a desired position if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved; and means for performing a seismic shooting operation if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has not moved,” as recited in amended claim 35. Accordingly, claims 5, 18, 30 and 35 are now patentable over Stephen, Orban, and Sato. Claim 6 is also patentable over Stephen, Orban, and Sato since it depends from claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen, Sato and ADXL202E. As mentioned above, claim 25 has been amended to now include “determining whether the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved more than an acceptable distance using the at least one initial inclination and the at least one current inclination; and if it is determined that the at least one ocean bottom cable has not moved more than the acceptable distance, then performing a seismic shooting operation.” Applicants respectfully submit that neither Stephen, nor Sato, nor ADXL202E, alone or in combination, teaches this newly added limitation. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As to new claims 37-42, Applicants submit that these claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed, taught, nor otherwise suggested by the cited references, and as such, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/      Date: February 5, 2009

Ari Pramudji  
Registration No. 45,022  
Pramudji Wendt & Tran, LLP  
1800 Bering, Suite 540  
Houston, Texas 77057  
Telephone: (713) 468-4600  
Facsimile: (713) 980-9882  
Attorney for Assignee